

MAY OVERRIDE TAFT'S VETO

HOUSE DEMOCRATS THINK THEY COULD PASS WOOL BILL.

So chance of beating a veto in the Senate. La Follette and Underwood preparing a compromise bill—Congress may not adjourn next week.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 4.—Predictions were made by Democratic leaders to-night that if President Taft vetoes the wool bill, it is expected to come from the conference committee the House will pass the measure over his veto. Representative Underwood, the Democratic leader, expressed the belief that a sufficient number of votes can be mustered in the House, if need be, to override a veto in the case of the wool bill.

The confidence of the Democrats in their ability, combining with insurgent Republicans, to override a veto of the wool bill is based on the vote cast on the Underwood bill in the House on June 20. The Underwood bill was passed in the House on a vote of 167 to 107. Of those voting in the affirmative 23 were Republicans. Six members answered present but did not vote. There were 62 absentees, of whom 26 were Republicans.

The House as at present constituted is composed of 388 members, there being three vacancies caused by death. Representative Loudenslager of New Jersey, Republican, is seriously ill and will be unable to attend the sessions of the House during the remainder of the session. This leaves 387 "live" votes. There were 228 members present when the wool bill passed in the House in June. Two hundred and twenty-six votes, a trifling excess of two-thirds of those present, were needed to override a veto.

The Democrats figure on the insurgents standing pat in opposition to the Administration in the event that they attempt to override the President should he veto the compromise wool bill, which from present indications is certain to be reported by the conference committee to the House and the Senate. Of the thirty-two Republicans who were absent from the House when the vote was taken on the wool bill three are insurgents—Carey of Wisconsin, Hubbard of Iowa and Warburton of Washington. A fourth Republican, Representative Hanna of New Jersey, who has bolted the regular camp on the tariff because of the assistance of the President in expounding Canadian reciprocity, it is also believed would vote to pass the wool bill over the President's veto.

The Democrats declare that on the question of overriding a veto of a party bill they could count on the return of practically all of the thirty Democrats who were absent when the vote was taken on the Underwood bill on June 20. They also say that Representative Berger, the Milwaukee Socialist, would gleefully vote to pass the bill over the President's veto.

Close figuring shows there is justification for the belief of the Democrats that the House, if an opportunity is given, will pass a wool bill over the Executive veto. The margin would be narrow, but Democratic hopes of success in this regard are strengthened by the fact that it would be necessary to muster only two-thirds of the members present.

That the Democrats will go to the extreme of passing the wool bill over the Executive veto if the insurgent Republicans will stand pat is certain. All they can accomplish by such a course is to emphasize the factional differences among the Republicans of the House. Mr. Underwood and his associates are not likely to overlook a chance to make the insurgents serve Democratic partisan purposes.

There is not even a possibility of the Senate overriding the President's veto on any of the Democratic tariff bills. The margin of difference between the insurgent-Democratic combine on the one hand and the Republicans on the other is narrow, giving the "alliance" a small majority; but it would not be possible to muster a two-thirds vote against the President on any proposition in the Senate. So it is apparent, therefore, that if the House Democrats carry out their threat of attempting to override the President's veto of the wool bill this course would be taken only as a means of embarrassing the Republicans.

It developed to-day that Senator La Follette and Representative Underwood, chairman of the House Ways and Means committee, who compose the sub-committee that is trying to work out an agreement between the House and the Senate on the wool bill, are wide apart in their ideas as to what the compromise measure should be. The two conferees got together for two hours to-day and there was a frank interchange of views. Chairman Underwood believes that the Senate should accept a measure carrying approximately the duties in the House bill. These are based on 20 per cent. on raw wool and corresponding duties on the manufactured products. Senator La Follette, far from being disposed to make concessions downward, is disposed to stand 30 per cent. on raw wool, as provided by the Senate bill, and the accompanying duties on manufactured products of wool. The whole purpose of the conference appears to be to send to President Taft a bill that will cause him to hesitate before he vetoes it, and one out of which political capital can be made against him, provided he does veto it.

Senator La Follette believes that the duties in the bill the harder the wool is to be made, the more the duties should be. The Senator from Wisconsin evidently does not want to agree to a bill in which the duties are so low that they would be condemned by Republicans generally as being the necessary protective feature.

The conference committee on the wool bill today delegated the duty to La Follette and Underwood of compromising the differences. They alone, in effect, will prepare the wool bill to be reported back to the conference.

It is generally believed that La Follette and Underwood will be able to reach a compromise after one or two meetings. Senator La Follette appears to be running the matter. He seems to hold the key to the situation. The Democrats feel that the wool bill is the measure that will divide the House and if they cannot get their bill passed they are apt to adopt Senator La Follette's rather than to have no legislation.

The conference committee on the wool bill today delegated the duty to La Follette and Underwood of compromising the differences. They alone, in effect, will prepare the wool bill to be reported back to the conference.

It is generally believed that La Follette and Underwood will be able to reach a compromise after one or two meetings. Senator La Follette appears to be running the matter. He seems to hold the key to the situation. The Democrats feel that the wool bill is the measure that will divide the House and if they cannot get their bill passed they are apt to adopt Senator La Follette's rather than to have no legislation.

The conference committee on the wool bill today delegated the duty to La Follette and Underwood of compromising the differences. They alone, in effect, will prepare the wool bill to be reported back to the conference.

bill Monday. The prompt bringing of that measure before the Senate is likely to extend the session for a week or more. Heretofore there has been a general feeling in both houses that Congress would be able to complete its work and adjourn not later than Saturday, August 12.

There is considerable opposition to the cotton bill, introduced by Republican Senator La Follette, and the most vigorous opposition to the measure comes from some of the Senators in the Southern States, where cotton manufacturing is carried on extensively. This is especially true of North Carolina. The consideration of the cotton bill, unlike its predecessors the wool bill and the free list bill, will proceed without any definite agreement on a date for taking the vote.

Most of the Democrats are tired out and would like to get away, but the insurgent Republicans are anxious to have the cotton bill sent to the President along with other tariff legislation. Speaking for them to-day, Senator Cummins said that he thought it was the duty of the extra session of Congress not only to provide for the cotton bill, but also to provide for the cotton schedule, but the sugar schedule and the metal schedule.

When the cotton bill came up in the Senate to-day, Senators Overman and Simmons of North Carolina sought to have the bill delayed before the Senate Finance Committee until Southern cotton manufacturers might be heard, but the Senate was in no mood to delay matters. The vote by which the bill was referred to the Finance Committee and ordered to be reported to the Senate on August 10 was 38 to 26. All the insurgents but one (Kenyon), lined up with the Democrats and furnished the necessary votes.

The appearance of the House cotton bill in the Senate provoked a lively debate. Senator Martin of Virginia, Democratic leader, made the motion to refer the bill to the Finance Committee with instructions to report it back not later than August 10. Immediately Senator Overman was on his feet and moved to amend Senator Martin's motion by extending the time allowed the Finance Committee to report the measure back until August 21.

"It comes with very poor grace from Senators on that side," said Mr. Smith, pointing his finger at the Democrats, "to have it for delay. It is a Southern industry that is involved. Last week we passed a free trade measure affecting industries with more than a million employees, giving any of those affected a chance to be heard, without so much as a word of warning."

Senator Cummins took a hand for the insurgent Republicans and served notice that he was opposed to having the session adjourn until not only the wool schedule and the cotton schedule had been revised, but the duties lowered on sugar, metals and other leading schedules.

Mr. Cummins was asked by Senator Overman if he would insist on such a course if the President should veto the wool bill and assign as a reason that he desired further information from the Tariff Board.

"I would still favor going forward with our bill," replied Mr. Cummins. "The Congress has its duty to pass laws; the President has his duty to approve or disapprove them. We have plenty of information on which to revise the cotton schedule."

LIEUT. BRILLHART'S SUICIDE.
Navy Department Will Accept Doctor's Report That He Was Temporarily Insane.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 4.—The Navy Department will accept the report of the physicians who conducted an autopsy on the body of Lieut. Charles E. Brillhart, who committed suicide yesterday in New York by shooting himself in the head. In substance the New York physicians found that Lieut. Brillhart was afflicted with meningitis and that he killed himself during temporary aberration of the mind.

Friends of Lieut. Brillhart say there was no apparent reason in the world why he should kill himself. They admit, however, that he had been suffering heavily recently, which accounted for his overstaying his leave of absence, which expired on July 31. It is said that he said he would not take such a task for his conduct, but not in such a manner as to cause Brillhart to take his life.

Lieut. Brillhart, who this morning received the letter addressed to him by Lieut. Brillhart before he shot himself, was prostrated when she read it and has since been confined to her room. If alive, it is said, she will return to her home, which will take place at York, Pa., to-morrow.

PERFECTING RAILWAY CASES.
Seven State Attorneys-General Getting Arguments Ready for Supreme Court.

ST. LOUIS, Aug. 4.—"Cost accounting," which relates to the manner of dividing the expense of doing business between State and interstate traffic, was the principal topic of discussion to-day at the conference of the Attorneys-General of seven States being held here. The attorneys agreed that the gross revenue basis for the division of the operating expenses, etc., is proper instead of the tonnage basis, which has been the basis of the Interstate Commerce Commission's decision in the October term of the Supreme Court of the United States has railroad cases brought by the States of Missouri, Minnesota, Arkansas, Kentucky and Oregon. The conference was called by Attorney-General Elliott W. Major of Missouri for the purpose of discussing the questions involved in all the cases in order to present them in a uniform manner.

It is probable that the Missouri case will be the first to come up in the Supreme Court. It involves both the two-cent passenger fare and the maximum freight laws and was argued at the term of the Supreme Court in October, 1910, by Mr. Major.

The court, after having the case under consideration for six months, ordered it redocketed and reargued. The railroad had won in the lower court and the case was appealed by the State.

The Weather.

Aug. 5.—The center of the Eastern area of high pressure was off the New England coast yesterday and the pressure was still high everywhere east of Michigan and the lower Mississippi Valley.

The disturbance in the north central States, which definite formation and with its center over Minnesota, was entering the upper lake regions and causing rain generally in the central valleys and the lakes.

Main also fell in the south Atlantic and east Gulf States. In the middle Atlantic States and there were a few showers in the Northwest.

The pressure was low in the Southwest, but the weather was generally fair in that section. It was warmer in the Ohio and Tennessee valleys, the lake regions and on the north Atlantic coast, also in Kansas and Colorado and northwest to the Pacific coast.

On the south Atlantic coast and in Montana, North Dakota and Minnesota it was cooler. Temperatures generally were about normal.

In this city the day was fair to partly cloudy, with moderate breeze, with fresh sea breeze, average humidity, 75 per cent.; barometer, corrected to read to sea level, at 8 A. M., 30.15; 3 P. M., 30.12.

The temperature yesterday, as recorded by the thermometers, is shown in the annexed table.

WASHINGTON FORECAST FOR TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW.

For eastern New York, eastern Pennsylvania and New Jersey, northeast weather, with probable showers to day and to-morrow; light to moderate southeast breeze.

For New England, overcast to day, probably followed by local showers by to-night and to-morrow; not much change in temperature; light to moderate southeast breeze.

WAS HE DR. WILEY'S NEMESIS?

SOLICITOR MCCABE UNDER CROSS-EXAMINATION.

Dr. Wiley's Counsel Tries to Prove That McCabe Was the Secret Power in the Agricultural Department Which Stripped Wiley's Bureau of Power.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 4.—Is Solicitor McCabe the power behind the throne in the Department of Agriculture, the nemesis of the bureau of chemistry and of Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, its chief? Henry C. Davis, personal counsel for Dr. Wiley, began his cross-examination of Mr. McCabe before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department this morning and it was apparent that this is what he was endeavoring to prove.

He questioned the Solicitor at length about "Order 140," issued by Secretary of Agriculture Wilson July 1, 1910, which stripped Dr. Wiley and his associates in the bureau of chemistry of all power to say whether or not the food and drug act should be rigidly interpreted and enforced by prosecutions. Under his grill Mr. McCabe admitted that he now had the sole power of determining whether or not prosecutions for violations of the pure food law should be undertaken.

Prior to July 1, 1910, when this order was issued, determination of this question lay with the food and drug inspection board of the bureau of chemistry, composed of Dr. Wiley, Dr. Dunlop and Solicitor McCabe. Two of the board constituted a majority and could bring about a prosecution in any case. But this was changed, and now Dr. Wiley can do no more than recommend that a prosecution be undertaken. McCabe has the veto power.

Other matters of interest were developed to-day. For instance, it came to light that Solicitor McCabe had given an opinion that Dr. Wiley need not testify in the case of the State of Indiana against certain food manufacturers and users of benzoate of soda. McCabe frankly admitted that he did not want Dr. Wiley to testify, because he knew he would testify against the Remsen board and Secretary Wilson. When McCabe goes on the stand to-morrow morning Mr. Davis will resume his cross-examination and interesting developments are expected.

"State the specific charge against Dr. Wiley," demanded Mr. Floyd, and the committee members and spectators sat up and began to take notice. Mr. McCabe replied that Dr. Wiley, Dr. Rusby, Dr. Kohler and Dr. Bigelow had entered into an agreement that Dr. Rusby would not be required to work more than eighty days in a year and would receive an annual salary of \$1,000. The committee on personnel, the solicitor said, believed that this agreement was unlawful in view of the previously rendered opinion of the Attorney-General concerning the necessity of a maximum per diem rate conforming to the corresponding legal annual compensation.

"Was it the appointment of Dr. Rusby approved by the Secretary of Agriculture?" Mr. McCabe said it was.

"Do you regard the Remsen board as connected with the bureau of chemistry and under Dr. Wiley?" Mr. Floyd continued.

"Under Dr. Wiley," Mr. McCabe answered.

The Solicitor testified to-day that since July 1, 1910, the bureau of chemistry had recommended prosecutions in 2,800 cases. Of this total he approved 140 for prosecution and for various reasons acted adversely on 265. The committee wanted to know about some of the cases he had turned down.

"Well," said the Solicitor, "I'll tell you of one of them. The bureau of chemistry recommended the prosecution of the case of the Wharfedale Chemical Co. and began to take notice. Mr. McCabe replied that Dr. Wiley, Dr. Rusby, Dr. Kohler and Dr. Bigelow had entered into an agreement that Dr. Rusby would not be required to work more than eighty days in a year and would receive an annual salary of \$1,000. The committee on personnel, the solicitor said, believed that this agreement was unlawful in view of the previously rendered opinion of the Attorney-General concerning the necessity of a maximum per diem rate conforming to the corresponding legal annual compensation."

"Was it the appointment of Dr. Rusby approved by the Secretary of Agriculture?" Mr. McCabe said it was.

"Do you regard the Remsen board as connected with the bureau of chemistry and under Dr. Wiley?" Mr. Floyd continued.

"Under Dr. Wiley," Mr. McCabe answered.

The Solicitor testified to-day that since July 1, 1910, the bureau of chemistry had recommended prosecutions in 2,800 cases. Of this total he approved 140 for prosecution and for various reasons acted adversely on 265. The committee wanted to know about some of the cases he had turned down.

"Well," said the Solicitor, "I'll tell you of one of them. The bureau of chemistry recommended the prosecution of the case of the Wharfedale Chemical Co. and began to take notice. Mr. McCabe replied that Dr. Wiley, Dr. Rusby, Dr. Kohler and Dr. Bigelow had entered into an agreement that Dr. Rusby would not be required to work more than eighty days in a year and would receive an annual salary of \$1,000. The committee on personnel, the solicitor said, believed that this agreement was unlawful in view of the previously rendered opinion of the Attorney-General concerning the necessity of a maximum per diem rate conforming to the corresponding legal annual compensation."

"Was it the appointment of Dr. Rusby approved by the Secretary of Agriculture?" Mr. McCabe said it was.

"Do you regard the Remsen board as connected with the bureau of chemistry and under Dr. Wiley?" Mr. Floyd continued.

"Under Dr. Wiley," Mr. McCabe answered.

The Solicitor testified to-day that since July 1, 1910, the bureau of chemistry had recommended prosecutions in 2,800 cases. Of this total he approved 140 for prosecution and for various reasons acted adversely on 265. The committee wanted to know about some of the cases he had turned down.

"Well," said the Solicitor, "I'll tell you of one of them. The bureau of chemistry recommended the prosecution of the case of the Wharfedale Chemical Co. and began to take notice. Mr. McCabe replied that Dr. Wiley, Dr. Rusby, Dr. Kohler and Dr. Bigelow had entered into an agreement that Dr. Rusby would not be required to work more than eighty days in a year and would receive an annual salary of \$1,000. The committee on personnel, the solicitor said, believed that this agreement was unlawful in view of the previously rendered opinion of the Attorney-General concerning the necessity of a maximum per diem rate conforming to the corresponding legal annual compensation."

"Was it the appointment of Dr. Rusby approved by the Secretary of Agriculture?" Mr. McCabe said it was.

"Do you regard the Remsen board as connected with the bureau of chemistry and under Dr. Wiley?" Mr. Floyd continued.

"Under Dr. Wiley," Mr. McCabe answered.

The Solicitor testified to-day that since July 1, 1910, the bureau of chemistry had recommended prosecutions in 2,800 cases. Of this total he approved 140 for prosecution and for various reasons acted adversely on 265. The committee wanted to know about some of the cases he had turned down.

"Well," said the Solicitor, "I'll tell you of one of them. The bureau of chemistry recommended the prosecution of the case of the Wharfedale Chemical Co. and began to take notice. Mr. McCabe replied that Dr. Wiley, Dr. Rusby, Dr. Kohler and Dr. Bigelow had entered into an agreement that Dr. Rusby would not be required to work more than eighty days in a year and would receive an annual salary of \$1,000. The committee on personnel, the solicitor said, believed that this agreement was unlawful in view of the previously rendered opinion of the Attorney-General concerning the necessity of a maximum per diem rate conforming to the corresponding legal annual compensation."

"Was it the appointment of Dr. Rusby approved by the Secretary of Agriculture?" Mr. McCabe said it was.

"Do you regard the Remsen board as connected with the bureau of chemistry and under Dr. Wiley?" Mr. Floyd continued.

ALL BRIBED, SAYS WHITE.

His Opinion of the Fifty-Three Democrats Who Voted for Lorimer.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 4.—Judge E. G. Haney, counsel for Senator Lorimer, continued to-day his efforts before the Senate committee which is investigating the election of Mr. Lorimer to break down the testimony of Representative Charles A. White, a Democratic member of the Illinois Legislature of 1909, who has confessed to receiving \$1,000 from Representative Lee O'Neill Browne, the leader of the Democrats in that Legislature, for voting for Mr. Lorimer.

Notwithstanding a rigorous cross-examination by Judge Haney, Representative White stuck to his story that he participated in the bribery transaction in order to obtain absolute evidence of corruption in Senator Lorimer's election and also in general legislation at Springfield. White denied the testimony of witnesses before the former investigating committee who said that White had boasted to them that he intended to get "enough money from that Lorimer bunch to support me the rest of my life."

White also denied that he had ever admitted to any one that he intended to extort money from Senator Lorimer through exposing the alleged bribery in the Lorimer election.

White insisted that his main idea was to obtain a written acknowledgment of the alleged bribery deal between himself and Representative Browne when he (White) wrote a letter to Senator Lorimer on December 1, 1909, advising Senator Lorimer that he intended to make an exposure of political conditions at Springfield. Judge Haney insists that this letter was for the prime purpose of blackmailing Senator Lorimer. White, however, said that it was his intention in writing this letter to obtain from Senator Lorimer written evidence of his knowledge of the alleged bribery deal.

White said that if Senator Lorimer had offered him money for the manuscript of his story of exposure he would have accepted the money as evidence but would not have given up his story.

White said that it was his personal belief that all of the fifty-three Democrats who deserted the Democratic candidate for the United States Senate and voted for Lorimer were bribed to do so.

There was a long legal argument over the admissibility of testimony regarding White's visits to disreputable resorts in the red light district of Chicago while in custody of officers of the State's Attorney of Cook county from April 29 to December 21, 1910. J. J. Marble, counsel for the committee, objected to this line of inquiry as soon as Judge Haney brought it up. Mr. Marble pointed out that it was not proper to investigate the conduct or administration of the office of the State's Attorney of Cook county.

Judge Haney defended the inquiries on the ground that they were necessary to bring out not only the character but also the methods employed by the persons who had engaged in a conspiracy to deprive Senator Lorimer of his seat in the Senate.

The committee consulted with its counsel and Judge Haney and allowed the line of inquiry to be pursued, subject to a reasonable limitation excluding disgusting details. Late in the afternoon Chairman Dillingham announced that the committee would call up this phase of the inquiry and told the women present the nature of the forthcoming testimony. All of the women left and the men who remained moved up into the front seats. The testimony, however, was not especially racy and continued only a few minutes.

DAY PORTRAIT SCANDAL.

The House Ready to Vote for the Dismissal of Col. Michael and Morrison.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 4.—If it had not been for Minority Leader Mann's filibustering tactics the House would have voted before adjourning to-day on the resolution introduced by Representative Dent of Alabama recommending to the President that Col. William H. Michael, formerly chief clerk of the State Department and now United States Consul-General at Calcutta, and Thomas Morrison, disbursing clerk of the State Department, be dismissed "for the good of the service" as a result of their connection with the Day portrait mystery, but Mr. Mann and his Republican colleagues, who think the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department, of which Representative Mann is chairman, is chairman, made a hard-sided, baserous and just report on the connection of Michael and Morrison with the portrait proposition, now eight years old, delayed matters to to-night, adjourned and will continue the discussion to-morrow.

FOR GARFIELD MONUMENT AT LONG BRANCH.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 4.—A favorable report from the Committee on the Library on the bill to erect a monument at Long Branch, N. J., to commemorate the death of James A. Garfield, was made to the Senate to-day by Senator Root.

Army and Navy Orders.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 4.—Navy orders were issued to-day: Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

Lieut. C. C. Moore, from Portsmouth yard to Asiatic station.

SENATE HAS THE TREATIES

LITTLE PROSPECT FOR RATIFICATION AT THIS SESSION.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 4.—The Senate this morning ordered stricken from the Congressional Record a letter from Duncan Walker of New Jersey and constructively delivered a rebuke to Senator Martine of that State, who offered the letter, because of a complaint by Senator Bailey of Texas that the document was personally offensive to him.

The letter was a reply from the son of Robert J. Walker, the former of the Democratic tariff of 1896, to some remarks delivered by Mr. Bailey in the Senate recently. The Senator characterized the reading of the letter as an "indecent performance" and moved that it be stricken from the Record.

Senator Martine became somewhat excited and advancing into the center aisle of the Senate insisted with vehemence and considerable waving of the arms that it was a "trouble of the honored son of an honored father" to come to the defense of a parent who had been "traduced and misrepresented." He said much more to the same general purport and effect.

Finally, seeing the temper of the Senate in regard to a reply of the character of the Walker letter to a Senator's statement, Mr. Martine attempted to withdraw the letter, but Mr. Bailey objected.

The roll was then called and forty-nine Senators voted to expunge the letter from the Record. There were no votes in opposition. Mr. Martine voted. Mr. Bailey remained silent when his name was called.

Duncan S. Walker is now 75 years of age and lives in Hoboken, N. J. The letter was in answer to statements made by Senator Bailey a few days ago in a debate with Senator John Sharp Williams of Mississippi, in the course of which Mr. Bailey charged that a letter written by Walker on the tariff somewhat late in life was a deliberate change in front from the position he had taken and the principles he held in 1896 when the Walker tariff was framed.

Mr. Bailey said that Walker became a Republican officeholder before his death and that while in Kentucky he had misrepresented facts with reference to the repudiated bonds of Mississippi.

Duncan Walker sought to refute all these charges, saying his father was a Union Democrat and that there were many like him, and had favored the second nomination of Abraham Lincoln, but had never voted with the Republican party.

He went on to say that he had been a European financial agent of the Treasury Department to sell \$250,000,000 of Government bonds, but the statements attributed to his father in connection with the repudiated bonds of Mississippi were untrue and did him an injustice.

The two conventions were not officially received by the Senate to-day. They are supposed to be in the custody of Vice-President Sherman. M. C. Latta, executive clerk, arrived from the White House at the Senate chamber shortly after the Senate met. He carried a list of nominations and a large sealed envelope which enclosed the treaties. The sealed package was placed on the Vice-President's desk and laid there for the rest of the afternoon. Executive communications of that character are not received in open session. The Vice-President was evidently waiting for an executive session to lay the treaty before the Senate and to have it referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, following the usual course.

Senator Cullom, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, conceived the idea of having the treaties made public without delay, but after he had conferred with some of the Senate leaders he was dissuaded from his purpose. The Senate waited for a lively tumult in the Senate over the cotton bill to subside in order that he might move an executive session, but before he was ready Senator Heyburn got the floor to make a speech on the Statehood resolution and before he had proceeded very far in his remarks complained that there was not a quorum of Senators present.

The roll was called and pages were hurried out to bring in the absentees, but they were only able to muster thirty-two Senators, fourteen less than a quorum. Thereupon a motion was made to adjourn. The Senate adjourned until to-morrow without an executive session, leaving not only the arbitration treaties suspended in mid-air, but also Senator Heyburn's Statehood speech.

Vice-President Sherman took charge of the treaties. Undoubtedly they will be laid before the Senate at the first executive session and promptly referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

This is THE Pipe Dream

Some time, somewhere, someone may make tobacco like Prince Albert—but that happenin is still wrapped up in the hope-so package, tied tight. No pipe-smoker ever went to a dream of a smoke like P. A. No cigarette smoker ever compounded a roll like he can make with P. A. That's because no other tobacco is made like P. A. The flavor is up in the big-money class and the stinger is cut out in the makin.

Some time, somewhere, someone may make tobacco like Prince Albert—but that happenin is still wrapped up in the hope-so package, tied tight. No pipe-smoker ever went to a dream of a smoke like P. A. No cigarette smoker ever compounded a roll like he can make with P. A. That's because no other tobacco is made like P. A. The flavor is up in the big-money class and the stinger is cut out in the makin.

Some time, somewhere, someone may make tobacco like Prince Albert—but that happenin is still wrapped up in the hope-so package, tied tight. No pipe-smoker ever went to a dream of a smoke like P. A. No cigarette smoker ever compounded a roll like he can make with P. A. That's because no other tobacco is made like P. A. The flavor is up in the big-money class and the stinger is cut out in the makin.

Some time, somewhere, someone may make tobacco like Prince Albert—but that happenin is still wrapped up in the hope-so package, tied tight. No pipe-smoker ever went to a dream of a smoke like P. A. No cigarette smoker ever compounded a roll like he can make with P. A. That's because no other tobacco is made like P. A. The flavor is up in the big-money class and the stinger is cut out in the makin.

Some time, somewhere, someone may make tobacco like Prince Albert—but that happenin is still wrapped up in the hope-so package, tied tight. No pipe-smoker ever went to a dream of a smoke like P. A. No cigarette smoker ever compounded a roll like he can make with P. A. That's because no other tobacco is made like P. A. The flavor is up in the big-money class and the stinger is cut out in the makin.

Some time, somewhere, someone may make tobacco like Prince Albert—but that happenin is still wrapped up in the hope-so package, tied tight. No pipe-smoker ever went to a dream of a smoke like P. A. No cigarette smoker ever compounded a roll like he can make with P. A. That's because no other tobacco is made like P. A. The flavor is up in the big-money class and the stinger is cut out in the makin.

Some time, somewhere, someone may make tobacco like Prince Albert—but that happenin is still wrapped up in the hope-so package, tied tight. No pipe-smoker ever went to a dream of a smoke like P. A. No cigarette smoker ever compounded a roll like he can make with P. A. That's because no other tobacco is